



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We know that the root of the latter word appears in various Indo-European words and that it shows the following development: (1) belly or womb, (2) foetus, child, (3) young, for example, child, pig, calf, foal, whelp, etc. Cf. Sanskrit *gārbha* 'womb, fruit of the womb, newborn child'; Greek *δολφός* and *δελφύς* 'womb,' *βρέφους* 'foetus, babe, cub,' etc., *δέλφας* 'suckling pig'; Gallic-Latin *Galba* 'belly, Big-belly'; English *moon-calf*, 'false conception, monstrosity,' Old-English, etc., *cealf* 'calf,' 'young deer,' etc.; Old-High-German *kilburra*, Old-English *čilforlamb*, English *chilwer*, 'ewe lamb,' Swiss *kilber* 'young ram.' The same development of meaning is shown also in other roots, for example, Latin *venter* and *uterus* 'belly, womb, foetus, child,' Gothic *qīpus*, etc.¹

Now, it is not difficult to show that in *calf of the leg* we have a special development of the early meaning of the word, namely, 'belly.' The word for belly is in all languages used figuratively of the bulging part of an object. Thus *γαστήρ* is applied to a shield, a bottle, a vessel, a turnip, and the like; Latin *venter* is applied to a gourd, a flagon, the ankle, etc.; German *bauch* is applied to a pot, a keg, a bottle, a ship, a sail; and our *belly* is applied to a pot, a bottle, a pear, an archer's bow, and many other things that bulge out. Of special interest to us now is the application of such words to the large part of a muscle. In this way the Greeks used *γαστήρ*, the Germans use *bauch*, and we use *belly* and *venter*. See *The Oxford Dictionary*: "*belly*, the central portion of a muscle." "[This muscle] was called Digastricus because it hath two Venters or Bellies," Crooke, *Body of Man*, 759 (1615). "Muscles which have a bulging centre or belly," Todd and Bowman, *Phys. Anat.* i, 176 (1845). The calf of the leg is, then, simply the belly or bulging part of the leg. For exactly the same figure, compare Greek *γαστήρ* 'belly,' *κνήμη* 'the part of the leg between the knee and the ankle,' *γαστροκνήμη* or *γαστροκνημία* 'calf of the leg,' also Maux *bolg* 'belly,' *bol-gane* (literally 'little belly') 'calf of the leg.'

GEORGE HEMPL.

Ann Arbor.

¹ Is the fact that various words (for example *χοῖρος*, *δελφάκιον*, *porcus*, etc.) mean both '*puerulus muliebris*' and 'pig' to be explained in the same way? Or is it due to the fact that the matrix of a sow (*vulva*) was a favorite dish with the ancients?

MILTON'S CLASSICAL MYTHOLOGY.

IN his list of the Greek gods who appear among the fallen Angels (*Paradise Lost* I. 508-521), Milton speaks of

Titan, Heaven's first-born
With his enormous brood, and birthright seized
By younger Saturn.

In view of the mistaken interpretations of these lines which are found in various commentaries of Milton, it may be well to point out certain passages in late classical writers which remove all difficulties of explanation.

According to the common account of these events given in Hesiod (*Theogony* 133-138; 164-182; 459-462) it was Oceanus, and not Titan, whose birthright was seized by his brother Saturn. To be sure, Oceanus was a Titan, but the name Titan alone was never used to designate Oceanus, and the two names were never confused. Keightley observes that there never was a person in Greek mythology known simply as Titan; Browne repeats his observation; Verity is uncertain of Milton's meaning; Moody, in the Cambridge edition, says, with the temerity seldom seen in the careful student of Milton, that the poet's scholarship seems here to be at fault. Another explanation is, that the poet means Oceanus when he says Titan, because in the next line he mentions his enormous brood, who were some six thousand river-gods, children of Oceanus, in part enumerated by Hesiod (*Theog.* 337-361).

Milton's allusion, however, is based upon an account given by Lactantius in his *Divine Institutions*, I. 14. This author quotes Ennius to the effect that Uranus had two sons, Titan and Saturn. When Uranus ceased to rule, Titan demanded the throne on the ground that he was older than Saturn. But their mother, Vesta (not Earth, as in Hesiod and the earlier writers), and their sisters, Ceres and Ops, induced Saturn to keep the power. Titan finally yielded to his brother's claim on condition that the male children of Saturn should be destroyed at birth in order to secure the reversion to his own line. When Jove was born he was stolen away and reared in secret. For this breach of faith Titan vanquished and imprisoned Saturn, but was conquered in turn by Jove, together with his twelve sons, the Titans. A similar version is found in the apocryphal *Sibylline Oracles* (III. 110—a part which Alexandre assigns to the second century be-

fore Christ), except that Earth, not Vesta, is the mother of Titan and Cronus, and a third brother, Iapetus, figures in the strife for the throne (cf. *P. L.* I. 510), while Cronus is older than Titan. The story has also been connected, as it is in the *Sibylline Oracles*, with the building of the Tower of Babel, and the strife between Titan and Saturn is regarded as an episode in the confusion of tongues. It is inserted by Eusebius in an account of the Tower of Babel which he quotes from Abydenus (*Preparatio Evangelica* IX. 14; cf. the Byzantine Georgius Syncellus, *Chronographia* 44 D, and the *Mythologia* of Natalis Comes, Book II, an epitome of mythology dating from 1600, which Milton must have known). Diodorus makes Euhemerus his authority for the statement that an ancient prince named Uranus had by Vesta two sons, Titan and Cronus (VI. 2). In fact, this Titan mentioned by Milton was euhemeristic in character, and a late invention by sceptical students of mythology (M. Mayer, *Die Giganten und die Titanen in der Antiken Sage und Kunst* 72).

All this is significant, both as showing the true meaning of the passage under discussion, and as illustrating an important fact in Milton's use of classical mythology. In the first place, it is clear that Milton has not confused Titan with Oceanus, and that he has good classical authority for his distinction between them. Secondly, 'enormous brood,' of line 511, refers not to the Oceanids, but to the Titans, who were sons of Titan. This is further borne out by Milton's use elsewhere of the word 'enormous.' If it referred to the Oceanids, it would in effect mean 'numerous,' but the more conservative meaning is kept in the two remaining cases of its occurrence. In *P. L.* V. 297, we have the expression 'enormous bliss,' and in *P. L.* VII. 411, sea-monsters are described as 'enormous in their gait.' Here the meaning is 'extraordinary in magnitude, vast, immense,' with perhaps a suggestion in the latter case of 'monstrous'—meanings which would obviously be more appropriate to the Titans than to the Oceanids.

The question may now be asked why Milton has chosen the later and more obscure version in preference to the earlier and more celebrated account by Hesiod, and why he remains

so faithful to it. The whole passage, *P. L.* i. 505-521, lies in the direction of a favorite theory of the Fathers. Apparently beginning with a euhemeristic theory of mythology they endeavored to show that the Greek myths were only a deceived and perverted form of early Hebrew history, and they often identified Greek gods with Biblical personages, or found a place—usually a low one—for Greek legends and Greek deities in the Hebrew scheme. It thus becomes clear that Milton would find a patristic account more appropriate for use in a list of the fallen Angels, than one which was more ancient or more purely classical. This view of mythology found especial favor with him in his later life, and he often proves his interest in it, as when he follows the tradition that identified Ham, son of Noah, with Ammon or Jove (*P. L.* IV. 277), Eve with Eurynome (*P. L.* X. 581), and Japhet with Iapetus (*P. L.* IV. 717; cf. I. 508). See also *Paradise Regained* IV. 334-348; *Hymn on the Nativity* 89).

Since working out the results here given, I find that Patrick Hume, the first commentator on Milton, whose notes appeared in the edition of 1695, has given in substance the story of Titan as here told, but without any reference to its sources.

In this connection it is interesting to note a point of resemblance between *Paradise Lost* and *Le Tournement Antecrist*, an Old French poem of 3500 lines, by Huon de Méri, dating from about 1234. In the latter, as Antichrist goes forth to contend in tournament with the hosts of the Lord, he is surrounded by many of his barons, conspicuous among whom are Beelzebub, Jupiter, Saturn, Apollo, Mercury, Hercules, Neptune, Mars, and Cerberus, together with Pluto and Proserpina, the king and queen of Hell. Besides these there is a large following of such persons as Pride, Avarice, Hate, Felony, Sloth, Cruelty, and Gluttony, a little in the manner of the group around the throne of Chaos and Night (*P. L.* II. 963-966). Overhead streams the gorgeous banner of Antichrist, wrought by Proserpina. One is reminded of Dante's lines:

Ed io, che riguardai, vidi una insegna,
Che girando correva tanto ratta
Che d'ogni posa mi pareva indegna:

E dietro le ven'a sì lunga tratta
Di gente, ch' i' non avrei mai creduto,
Che morte tanta n' avesse disfatta.

Inferno III, 52-57.

So *Comus* :

Let him be girt
With all the griesly legions that troop
Under the sooty flag of Acheron,
Harpies and Hydras.

602-605.

Apropos of this passage, Warton cites from P. Fletcher's *Locusts* the line :

All Hell run out, and sooty flagges display.

CHARLES G. OSGOOD.

Yale University.

HELENA AND HOMUNCULUS: A
CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF
VEIT VALENTIN'S HYPO-
THESIS AND ITS LAST
DEFENSE.*

II.

*The Dramatic Structure of the Classical
Walpurgis-Night and the Dramatic
Purpose of Homunculus.*

IN order to clear the way for a brief examination of the dramatic structure of the Classical Walpurgis-Night and the dramatic purpose of Homunculus, it is necessary first to dispose of some preconceived opinions of Valentin.¹⁰

In the first place his contention (MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. xv, 1900, col. 401) that it is a 'klägliche Anschauungsweise' even to suppose that Goethe ever made use of *Faust* to give expression to scientific views of his is entirely unfounded. The plan of discussing the Neptunistic and Plutonistic theories in connection with the appearance of Enceladus-Seismos, for example, is clearly defined in the prose sketch of Dec. 17, 1826 (Paralip. 123, 1):

"Naturphilosophen die bey dieser Gelegenheit auch nicht ausbleiben konnten, Thales und Anaxagoras gerathen über das Phänomen heftig in Streit, jener dem Wasser wie dem

* *Errata* in the first part of this article: MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. xvi, col. 199, l. 20 f., read 'in the nature of a slight amplification and careful filing.' Col. 202, l. 35, read '177' instead of '17.' Col. 209, l. 15 ff. (deprints Col. 208, l. 10 ff. from below), read 'when Homunculus was transformed from a chemical dwarf into a spirit and the entire second act was written, Goethe's conception of the revivification of Helena, etc.'

¹⁰ Valentin's treatise on the Classical Walpurgis-Night, which was to appear this spring, has not yet come to hand as this article goes to press.

Feuchten alles zuschreibend, dieser überall geschmolzene, schmelzende Massen erblickend."

Had Goethe considered it inappropriate to express his views on scientific problems in *Faust*, he could have excluded not only the two philosophers but even Enceladus-Seismos just as well as he actually did exclude a good many other mythological characters.¹¹

In the second place, Valentin's claim (*ibid.*, col. 402) that the separate parts of *Faust* should not be considered and explained by themselves but with reference to the entire drama, is not justified in view of the conversation with Eckermann of Feb. 13, 1831 (Pniower, no. 851). Here Goethe says of the fourth act:

"Dieser Act bekommt wieder einen ganz eigenen Charakter, sodass er, wie eine für sich bestehende kleine Welt, das übrige nicht berührt und nur durch einen leisen Bezug zu dem Vorhergehenden und Folgenden sich dem Ganzen anschliesst"

and fully agrees with his young friend when the latter finds this to be equally true of the Classical Walpurgis-Night, the *Helena* and a number of other parts. It must, therefore, be perfectly proper to consider the Classical Walpurgis-Night primarily as an independent little world of its own, provided the 'leise(r) Bezug' to the preceding and following by which it is joined to the whole be not lost sight of.

In the third place, Valentin's statement (*ibid.*, col. 476):

"Thatsächlich ist aber die klassische Walpurgisnacht ausschliesslich dazu da, um uns zu zeigen, wie es möglich ist, dass die Helena wahrhaft lebend auftreten kann"

cannot have more than a purely subjective value because an authentic utterance of Goethe on the purpose of the Classical Walpurgis-Night does not exist. What Goethe says to Eckermann, Dec. 16, 1829¹² (Pniower, no. 738), refers only to the bulk of the first act and the first two scenes of the second, which were then completed, and what he writes to Zelter

¹¹ Says Goethe to Eckermann, Feb. 21, 1831 (Pniower, No. 855): "Das Schwierige indessen war, sich bei so grosser Fülle mässig zu halten und solche Figuren abzulehnen, die nicht durchaus zu meiner Intention passten."

¹² After Eckermann has observed that Helena gains the real 'Fundament' through Faust's dream of Leda, Goethe remarks:

"So auch . . . werden Sie finden, dass schon immer in diesen frühern Acten das Classische und Romantische anklingt und zur Sprache gebracht wird, damit es, wie auf einem steigenden Terrain, zur *Helena* hinaufgehe," etc.